

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 21, 2007 has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52, 54, 63 and 64

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52, 54, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,727) and in view of Crick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,793). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

As explained in Applicants' Response to Non-Final Office Action submitted on August 14, 2007, Ciacelli discloses a system for providing copyright data encrypted at a central processing unit to another software module executing at the central processing unit or to a peripheral device of a central processing unit, such as a decoder, for decryption. *Ciacelli*, col. 2, lines 55-63. An encrypted decryption algorithm can be sent with the copyright data. *Id.*, col. 5, lines 40-45.

Crick discloses a system for allocating memory for a plurality of software routines. *Crick*, Abstract. The Crick system includes a plurality of "component device drivers", including a device driver for decrypting data. *Id.*, col. 3, lines 31-41.

Turning to the claims, claim 1 recites "sending a first encrypted routine of a software driver to a peripheral device", "decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine", and "providing the plaintext routine to the software driver." The cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of "providing the plaintext routine to the software driver." According to the Office Action at page 5, this element is disclosed at column 3, lines 50-51 of Crick, which read as follows: "[a]nother software developer could develop component device driver 107 to encrypt and decrypt data." Applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited passage, nor any other portion of Crick, discloses or suggests providing a plaintext routine to a software driver. The cited passage merely indicates that a

software developer could write a device driver for encryption and decryption. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the device driver would be provided with a plaintext routine in any manner, including a plaintext routine generated based on a first encrypted routine of a software driver as recited in claim 1. Thus, the cited references fail to disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Claim 31 recites a peripheral device “to decrypt a first encrypted routine and generate a plaintext routine” and a software driver including instructions to execute the plaintext routine. As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a software driver that executes a plaintext routine based on a decrypted routine. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 31.

Claim 40 recites “a first hardware component to decrypt the first encrypted routine received by said interface and generate a plaintext routine” and “a second interface to output the plaintext routine for use by said software driver.” As explained above, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests providing a plaintext routine to a software driver, much less a plaintext routine resulting from the decryption of an encrypted routine, and therefore the cited references necessarily fail to disclose or suggest an interface to output a plaintext routine for use by the software driver, as recited in claim 40.

Claim 47 recites “decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine” and “providing the plaintext routine to a second software driver.” As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest these elements.

Claim 49 recites “decrypting, at the peripheral device, the first encrypted data to generate a plaintext data” and “providing the plaintext data to the application.” As explained above, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest these elements.

Claims 3, 8-13, 16, 63 and 64 depend from claim 1. Claims 32, 33, 38, and 39 depend from claim 31. Claims 41-43 depend from claim 40. Claims 51 and 52 depend from claim 49. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 3, 8-13, 33, 38, 39, 41, 51, and 52, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 8-13, 16, 31-33, 38-43, 47, 49, 50-52, 54, 63 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53

At page 9 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, in view of Crick et al., and in view of Freeman (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0129374). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 depend from claim 1. Claims 34, 35 and 37 depend from claim 31. Claims 44 and 46 depend from claim 40. Claim 53 depends from claim 49. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. Further, the other cited references do not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 31, 40, and 49. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

With respect to claim 17, the claim recites “decrypting, at the graphics chip, the first encrypted routine to generate a plaintext routine” and “storing the plaintext routine in memory in a location known to the software driver.” These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. The Office Action asserts at page 12 that Crick discloses these elements at column 3, lines 50-51. However, the cited portion of Crick discloses only that a software developer can write a device driver for encryption and decryption. Neither the cited passage, nor any other portion of Crick discloses storing a plaintext routine in any manner, including storing a plaintext routine in a location known to a software driver. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 17.

Claims 18, 19, 21-27, and 30 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claim 17. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 34, 35, 37, 44, 46 and 53 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections of Claims 6, 14, 15, 20, 28, 29, 36 and 45

At page 16 of the Office Action, claims 6, 20, 36 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, and in view of Crick et al., in view of Freeman, and in view of Ho (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,432). At page 17 of the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, in view of Crick et al., and in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,520,232). At page 18 of the Office Action, claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciacelli, and in view of Crick et al., in view of Freeman, and in view of Wilson. These rejections are hereby respectfully traversed.

Claims 6, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1. Claims 20, 28, and 29 depend from claim 17. Claim 36 depends from claim 31. Claim 45 depends from claim 40. As explained above, Ciacelli and Crick fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 17, 31, and 40. Further, the other cited references do not remedy the deficiencies of Crick and Ciacelli. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 17, 31 and 40. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 6, 14, 15, 20, 28, 29, 36 and 45 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)

September 25, 2007

Date